DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 329 388 RC 017 966

AUTHOR Rosborough, Marie; And Others
TITLE Rural Education: Some Problems and Solutions for South Carolina Schools.
PUB DATE 89
NOTE 40p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the National Rural Education Association (Reno, NV, October 6-7, 1990).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College School Cooperation; *Educational Technology; Elementary Secondary Education; Financial Support; Higher Education; Rural Areas; *Rural Education; Rural Schools; *School Demography; Small Schools; *State Universities; *Teacher Recruitment
IDENTIFIERS *South Carolina; University of South Carolina Columbia

ABSTRACT

Of South Carolina's 91 school districts, 24 are 100% rural. Comprised of small schools, these districts serve a large, sparsely settled geographic area, have a large minority student population, and are staffed by non-minority administrators and teachers. The small number of students and teachers severely limits a school's ability to provide for the special needs of students at both ends of the academic scale, resulting in lower scores on standardized tests. Most rural districts have relatively low tax bases and are able to generate only limited local funds. Solutions to these problems are being actively pursued. Special minority teacher and administrator recruitment programs provide low interest state loans which can be retired by teaching in a rural area. Collaborations between districts, school-university consortium arrangements, technology for distance learning, and school-based enterprises are overcoming the difficulties in school size to broaden and enrich curricular offerings. Suggestions for subsidizing teacher salaries in rural districts include paying hazardous duty pay, building teacherages or apartments, providing housing supplements or special housing loans, and paying incentives to keep teachers from leaving rural areas. Improving the productivity of rural schools involves changing attitudes about education through parent and community involvement and support. The rural education initiatives of the eight regional campuses of the University of South Carolina are profiled. Thirteen data tables are included in an appendix. (ALL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED329388

RURAL EDUCATION: SOME PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS FOR SOUTH CAROLINA SCHOOLS

by

Dr. Marie Rosborough
Dr. Larry Winecoff
Dr. Jack Lyday

RC017966

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Marie Rosborough

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

/ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

RURAL EDUCATION: SOME PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS

FOR SOUTH CAROLINA SCHOOLS

Dr.Marie Rosborough
Assistant Professor

Dr. Larry Winecoff
Professor

Dr. Jack Lyday
Associate Professor

South Carolina Public School Districts: 1951-1989

The number of school districts in South Carolina has decreased significantly over the past thirty-eight years. The first piece of sales tax legislation for the public schools of South Carolina was passed in 1951. At that time, South Carolina had more than 1,200 school districts. Each school district served an average of 492 students.

By the year 1960, the number of South Carolina school districts had declined to 109; and by 1984, the State had a total of 92 school districts. The most recent reduction in the number of school districts occurred during the 1986-87 school year; at which time two districts were combined into one; thus, reducing the total number to 91.

During this same period, the General Assembly of South Carolina passed several pieces of legislation which had major impact on public school education in South Carolina. Major legislation passed during the 70's and 80's include: The Teacher Employment and Dismisssal Act of 1974; the Education Finance Act of 1977; The Basic Skills Assessment Act of 1978; The Educator Improvement Act of 1979; The Education Improvement Act of 1984; and more recently, Target 2000 of 1989.

Today, the smallest school district in South Carolina (Marion 4) has a

student enrollment of 574 students in grades kindergarten through grade twelve. The School District of Greenville County is the largest school district in the State. Approximately 52,195 students in grades kindergarten through grade twelve are served by the Greenville County School System. The District Median enrollment for the ninety-one school districts is 3,799.

The ninety-one school districts of South Carolina serve a total of 630,376 students in kindergarten through grade twelve. Seventy of the ninety-one school districts have enrollments less than 10,000 students. Also, of the ninety-one school districts in the State of South Carolina, 53 have enrollments less than 5,000 students; 35 have enrollments less than 3,000; 23 have enrollments less than 2,000; and six of the ninety-one school districts have enrollments less than 1,000 students. {Enrollment figures are based on thirty- five day enrollment (Kindergarten-Grade 12) for the 1987-88 school year.}

More then 75% of the ninety-one school districts have experienced declines in student enrollment (Grades 1-12) over the past ten years: 1977/78 - 1988/89. Of those experiencing declines, thiry-four school districts have shown declines greater than 10%. Also, of those showing declines in enrollment, twenty experienced declines in excess of 15%. A total of six school districts out of the ninety-one school districts experienced enrollment declines of 20% or more over the ten year period, 1987/88 - 1988/89.

During this same ten year period, twenty three South Carolina school districts experienced some growth. Lexington One School District showed

the largest increase, with student enrollment increasing by 32.2%. Dorchester Two came in second with student enrollment increasing by 29.9%. Lexington Four showed the third largest growth in student enrollment over the ten year period, with enrollment increasing by 21.1%; followed by Beaufort County School District at 20.1%; Berkeley County School District at 17.3%; and Horry County School District at 16.8%.

Although a few districts experienced some growth over the ten year period from 1987-88 to 1988-89, the entire State of South Carolina saw a decline in student enrollment. During this ten year period, the public schools of the State lost more than 31,740 students in grades one through twelve due to declining enrollments. In general, South Carolina school districts have experienced an average decline in student enrollment of about 5.1% over the ten year period from 1977/88-1988/89.

Aiken County School District covers the largest geographic area (1,162 square miles). The smallest geographic area is 50 square miles. Three school districts fall into this category (Spartanburg 7, Sumter 17, and York 4). The State Median is 217 square miles.

More than 26% or a total of twenty-four South Carolina school districts are classfied as one hundred percent (100%) rural. An additional nineteen districts are 70% or more rural. Sixty-seven of the ninety-one school districts in the State of South Carolina are over 50% rural. South Carolina has a total population of 3,121,820 and is considered to be about 45.9% rural. The District Median for the State of South Carolina is 68.8% rural.

The Twenty-Four 100% Rural School Districts in South Carolina

South Carolina has twenty-four school districts that are classified as 100% rural. The School District of Spartanburg One is the largest of these with a population of 19,494. Dorchester Four School District is the second largest school district with a population of 14,849; followed by Jasper County School District with 14,504; and Orangeburg Three with a population of 13,803. Marion Four School District serves the smallest population of all the 100% rural school districts in South Carolina with only 2,558; followed by Orangeburg Seven with a population of 2,911; Orangeburg Eight with a population of 3,256; and Marion Three with a population of 3,400. Table 1 in the Appendix contains a complete listing of the twenty-four rural school districts classified as 100% rural in 1980. Table 2 in the Appendix contains population data, by school district.

Fifteen of the 100% rural school districts, or more than 62%, encompass geographic areas of 150 square miles or less. Jasper County School District encompasses the largest geographic area of all 100% rural school districts with 652 square miles. Orangeburg School District Seven has the smallest geographic area of the 100% rural school districts with 63 square miles. Orangeburg Seven also ranks 88 as the smallest in the entire State, in terms of geographic area served. In addition, ten of the 100% rural school districts are also among the twenty-five smallest school districts in the entire State of South Carolina, as measured by total geographic area in square miles. Table 2 contains information regarding the total geographic

area (square miles) for each of the 100% rural school districts.

In twenty-two of the 100% rural school districts, more than 50% of the population (eighteen years or older) have less than a high school education. Also, twenty of the twenty-four 100% rural school districts report that 20% or more of their households as single parent. Table 3 contains information regarding percent of population eighteen years old not completing high school, and percent of households managed by single parents, for each of the 100% rural South Carolina school districts for 1980.

More than 66% of the 100% rural school districts have median incomes of $12,000 or less. In addition, in seventeen school districts (70.8%), twenty percent or more of the families are classified as below the poverty level. Regarding free and reduced lunch eligibility, nineteen of the 100% rural school districts have 50% or more of their students qualifying for either free or reduced lunch. Also, seven of the 100% rural school district have 80% or more of their students qualifying for either free or reduced lunch. The School District of Clarendon One ranks first among the twenty-four 100% rural school districts, and also first in the entire State, as having the largest percent (96.5%) of pupils eligible for free/reduced lunch. Orangeburg Seven holds third place in the state, with 90.1% of the pupils in the district eligible for free/reduced lunch. (Refer to Tables 3 and 4 for additional information).

Twenty-two of the 100% rural school districts have enrollments of 3,000 students or less in kindergarten through grade twelve. Also, fifteen of

the 100% rural school districts have enrollments of 1,500 or less. A total of six 100% rural school districts have enrollments of less than 1,000 students (Kindergarten - Grade 12). These six rural school districts having enrollments of 1,000 or less students are also ranked the six smallest school districts in the entire State of South Carolina. Also, more than 33% of the 100% rural school districts have populations of 80% or more non-white. From 1977/78 to 1988/89, more than 58% (14 school districts) experienced a 10% or greater decline in student enrollment, in grades 1 - 12. Also, of those 100% rural school districts experiencing declines in enrollments, a total of 10 school districts experienced declines in excess of 16%. In addition, six of the 100% rural school districts experienced declines in student enrollment over the ten year period in excess of 20%. On the other hand, five of the 100% rural school districts reported some growth over the ten year period from1977/88 to 1988/89. Enrollment information for the twenty four 100% rural school districts is reported in Table 4.

In nineteen of the rural school district (62.5%), more than half of the high school graduates enter employment as opposed to post-secondary school. (Refer to Table 5).

Rural school districts typically have a very small labor force and a limited number of professional staff. More than 54% of the 100% rural school districts have professional staffs of 100 members or less. Marion Four School District has the smallest professional staff at 45. The rural school district having the largest professional staff is Spartanburg One

School District at 267. (Refer to Table 6.)

In twelve of the 100% rural school districts, teacher turnover typically exceeds 10%. Hampton Two has the highest teacher turnover at 30.1% followed by Orangeburg Seven at 26.5%. Clarendon One has 1.6% teacher turnover, which is the lowest in the State of all school districts. At the State level, teacher turnover averages approximately 9.0%. Table 7 contains the percent teacher turnover for each of the twenty-four 100% rural school districts.

Thirty-three percent of the 100% rural school districts are at the minimum of the State teacher salary schedule. The remainder of the rural school districts have teacher salary schedules which exceed the State minimum in small and varying amounts. Table 7 contains teacher salary information for the twenty-four 100% rural school districts.

In nine rural school districts, less than 30% of the professional staff have master's degrees. Also, in fourteen of the 100% rural school districts, the percent of professional staff having six year certificates or doctorates is 8% or less. The State average for master's degrees is 43% and for six-year or doctorate is 8.5%. (Refer to Table 6 for additional information on educational level, by school district.)

Five of the rural school districts have school boards that are appointed. Fourteen of the 100% rural school districts have no fiscal authority to raise millage. Nineteen of the 100% rural school districts have total tax levy of one hundred mills or more. Also, nine of the 100% rural school districts have mill values of $6,000 or less. In addition, eight of the

100% rural school districts rank among the top twelve school districts in the State in local tax effort for 1987 - 88. Hampton Two ranks first in the entire State and Marion Four ranks second in the State in terms of local tax effort. On the other hand, Clarendon Three and McCormick rank among the bottom twelve school districts in the State in local tax effort. Clarendon One ranks 83 in the State; followed by McCormick at 85. (Refer to tables 8 - 13.)

Problems Facing Rural Schools

Through a series of interviews and meetings over the past three years with rural school adminstrators, teachers, and students, the University of South Carolina has been collecting data related to problems faced by rural schools in the State. The problems identified are categorized into four groups: size and demographics; quality and breadth of instruction; financial/teachers and productivity.

1. Size and demographics

   Rural schools in South Carolina are typically small (less than 500) and serve a sparsely settled, rather large geographic area. Enrollment in these areas has, for the most part, been declining for over the past ten years.

   Many of the small rural school districts in the State have a student population which is 90 - 100% Black. In these same districts, it is not unusual to find a majority white school board and increasingly, white administators and teachers. The sharp reduction in the number of Black graduates in education has created special problems for rural

school districts. Typically rural districts pay teachers less than larger urban or suburban districts which are also recruiting minority teachers. In a recent study of thirteen private, historically Black institutions of higher education in the Southeast, the number of education graduates dropped from almost 27% (566) to 12% (252) of the total number of graduates between 1974 and 1984. (Study conducted by staff of Rural Education Center at U.S.C.) Furthermore, several of the institutions in the study group indicated that they were planning to drop teacher education as a field of study in the near future because of low enrollments (Staggers and Winecoff, pgs. 19 - 20).

Alternatives being pursued in South Carolina:

Special minority teacher and administrator recruitment programs have been initiated and are enjoying modest success. Rural teachers have been declared a "Critical Needs Area"' allowing prospective teachers to apply for low interest State loans which can be retired by teaching in a rural area (one year teaching retires one year of the loan). While some further consolidation of school districts is expected on a small scale, many educators feel that consolidation is not in the best interest of most rural school districts. Johnathan Sher makes the case most forcefully by saying that in most states educational policy is developed and implemented based on the needs of the larger, more vocal urban and suburban school districts at the expense of the smaller rural districts. Technology appears to be one of the feasible ways of

overcoming the difficulties in size while offering a viable program.

II. Quality and breadth of instruction

The small number of students and teachers severely limits a school's ability to provide for the special needs of students at both ends of the academic continuum. For example, in 1986, all high schools in South Carolina were required to make advanced placement courses available to students who were qualified. Nine school districts in the state were not able to comply: all were small rural schools in small rural districts. Most rural administrators in South Carolina report that they are unable to offer anything more than a basic curriculum required to meet minimum state standards. Students have few electives and only limited opportunity for remediation, acceleration and enrichment. Two problems associated with this situation are: (1) too few students qualify, elect, desire, or request any given option; and (2) a limited number of teachers are certified or qualified to teach in more than one area.

In vocational education the situation is equally problematic. In order to offer a vocational strand, there must be an adequate number of students and a large number of the graduates must be placed in related jobs. In rural areas, the small size (low enrollments) of the high schools is one problem which can sometimes be overcome by cooperative efforts among schools; however, job opportunities are extremely limited and it is difficult to place a significant number of students.

Alternatives:

School-based enterprises offer an alternative to the vocational education problem. Spearheaded in South Carolina by the State Economic Development Board, six rural schools will open enterprises this year while ten to sixteen others are in the process of developing their business plans for implementation next year. A school-based enterprise curriculum has been developed and, in a cooperative venture with North Carolina and Georgia, will be refined and more thoroughly tested this year.

Again, technology offers perhaps the most viable alternative. Through video, video disk, satellite links, information networks, electronic conferencing, and computer assisted and managed instruction, rural schools are able to broaden and enrich their curriculuar offerings. Intermediate school districts or school district-University consortium arrangements provide another alternative for sharing and maximizing human and material resources.

III. Financial/teachers

Most rural school districts have relatively low tax bases and are able to generate only limited local funds. This translates into scarce funds for capital outlay and often results in facilities and equipment which are less than adequate. It also means that teacher salary supplements are considerably lower than in urban or suburban districts, consequently teacher recruitment is more difficult and it is more difficult to retain teachers. Rural teachers often gain a few years of experience and

move to larger districts.

Many new teachers who accept positions in rural areas often cannot find adequate housing and are forced to commute long distances. This serves as a deterrent for prospective teachers who otherwise would like to teach in a rural area.

Alternatives:

Several school administrators are investigating the possibility of building teacherages or apartments for teachers at school district expense. Others suggest a State salary adjustment to include "hazardous duty pay," housing supplements, or subsidized housing loans to entice teachers to rural areas. They also suggest three or five year "re-up" pay incentives to help keep teachers from leaving rural areas.

In 1987, the USC Center for Rural Education administered a survey (adapted from Kemper and Mangieri, 1987) to juniors and seniors in twenty-four high schools in South Carolina identified as one hundred percent rural. Within each school the investigators selected fifteen juniors and seniors, who ranked academically in the top fifty percent of their respective classes, to participate in the survey. This produced a total of 357 usable responses.

Selected Findings included:

1. Contrary to many recent studies, a large percentage (45.8%) of the rural students who responded to this survey indicated that they were very (9.8%) or somewhat (36%) interested in teaching as a career.

One half of those expressing an interest in teaching were minority students. There appears to be no lack of interest among rural high school students, minority and non-minority, in teaching as a profession.

2. There is evidence to suggest that teaching could be promoted as a short-term career, rather than a lifelong career. Of those who said they were interested in teaching as a career, 59% said they would expect to teach less than 10 years; 46% indicated 10 to 20 years, and only 20% said they would expect to teach more than 20 years.

3. Of those students who demonstrated an interest in teaching, 20% indicated a preference for a rural area (less than 5,000 population) and 32% said they would teach in a small town (5,,000 - 20,000). This would indicate a sizable pool of future teachers is available for rural schools.

IV. Productivity

Historically, rural school students have performed less well on standardized tests than their urban and suburban counterparts. Parents are more likely to have a relatively low level of education and often have low educational expectations for their children; offer little help in the home with school work; and in general, do not place a high value on education.

Many rural school practitioners state that the mind set of the community must be changed before rural schools can be significantly improved.

Alernatives:

Fortunately, there are numerous instances where major attitudinal changes have been achieved and where education has emerged as a highly valued service in rural communities. Such changes are difficult and require strong support and cooperation from the key business and political leaders in the community as well as parents of students. Two pilot rural school (Alcolu and Nichols) in South Carolina, with assistance from the Southeastern Education Improvement Lab, have been able to "turn their schools and communities around" and appear to have made a significant change in the mindset of the total community. Both schools developed strong parent and community involvement strategies which supported teacher designed instructional programs. Both schools reported that this was the first time that they had been able to generate effective parent and community involvement and support.

Strong early intervention programs mandated in the South Carolina Education Improvement Act of 1984 have started to make a difference in rural areas of the state. Mandated kindergarten and more recently early childhood programs for students who are deemed "at risk" have begun to change the profile of productivity measures. The test scores presented in Chart I indicate that rural school students score lower than their counterparts from mixed (rural areas with one or more small town or city) or urban/suburban settings on both the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills and the South Carolina Basic Skills

Chart I
A Comparison of Rural, Mixed and Urban/Suburban School Districts
in South Carolilina on Select Variables 1987-88

	Rural	Mixed	Urban/Suburban
CTBS Grade 7	56.45	56,15	61.45
CTBS Grade 11	49.08	53.66	56.98
Basic Skills-Math Grade 1	87.64	87.31	88.37
Basic Skills-Math Grade 6	69.07	70.38	72.75
Basic Skills-Math Grade 10	74.89	77.05	80.18
Basic Skills-Reading Grade 1	86.04	83.46	85.89
Basic Skills -Reading Grade 6	74.48	74.43	76.98
Basic Skills-Reading Grade 10	75.23	75.73	80.41
Basic Skills-Writing Grade 6	75.66	79.35	78.40
Basic Skills-Writing Grade 10	74.60	76.67	81.87
CSAB (readiness)	74.57	74.66	75.93
% Grads Enter jr. or sr. College	41.42	42.75	48.84
Teen Pregnancies/1000	49.43	46.94	52.27
% Drop outs (1st grade'76; grad '88)	28.07	27.25	28.64
Teen drug abuse arrests	4.82	5.67	16.83
Teen alcohol abuse arrests	30.46	23.68	50.39

The test scores presented in Chart I have already been discussed in the previous section. This chart also indicates that other factors which afffect the quality of life may favor rural and mixed (rural with small towns) communities. these include:

1. A large percentage of rural students do continue their education after high school (41.42%);
2. The drop out rate for rural school is essentially the same as in mixed and urban/uburban schools;
3. Teenage pregnancies are slightly lower in rural and mixed communities than in urban/suburban communities;
4. The rate of drug and alcohol arrests among teenagers is considerably lower in rural and mixed communities than in urban/suburban communities.

Assessment Program at the upper grade levels. The data also indicate that rural school students are now scoring as well as or better than students from mixed or urban/suburban districts on the Cognitive Skills Assessment Battery (school readiness test) and in reading and math at the first grade level. As late as 1983-84, rural school students were scoring behind mixed and urban/suburban students at all grade levels.

Rural Education in South Carolina: A Summary of Initiatives

The University of South Carolina was founded in 1801 and is one of the oldest state supported institutions in the United States. In fact, the University of South Carolina was the first college in the United States to be supported entirely by public funds. Today, the University of South Carolina is a nine-campus system, with the main campus located in Columbia, and with regional campuses located in various areas throughout the State of South Carolina. Because of the nine-campus system, the University of South Carolina is better able to serve the rural school districts of the State at locations which are near the education community. The eight regional campuses of the University of South Carolina are located in: Allendale, Aiken, Beaufort, Lancaster, Sumter, Union, Conway, and Spartanburg.

University of South Carolina- School District Initiatives

The College of Education of the University of South Carolina delivers a variety of programs and services for professional staff in the ninety-one school districts of South Carolina. The College of Education works collaboratively with individual school districts and with consortia of school districts to plan and design new programs specifically targeted for the rural school districts of South Carolina. By working with individual school districts in the State and by working with consortia of schools districts, the College of Education is able to deliver both graduate and undergraduate programs, and programs of staff

development to school districts across the State. The consortium arrangement facilitates the efficient and effective delivery of both programs and services to professional staffs in the member districts. It also promotes cooperation and collaboration among participating school districts; and may serve as an effective framework for curriculum planning and other curriculum development/improvement initiatives. The largest consortium of school districts in South Carolina is Salkehatchie. With a membership in excess of twenty school districts (mostly rural), the Salkehatchie Consortium consists of a director and the superintendents of the participating school districts.

University of South Carolina- Faculty Initiatives

Faculty within the College of education at the University of South Carolina are involved in a variety of training, educational research, and technical assistance projects which are designed to meet theparticular needs of the rural school districts. Programs range froState, National, and international conferences, institutes, and workshops; to the development and dissemination of competency-based programs.

The University of South Carolina - Center for Rural Education

The Center for Rural Education is located in the College of Education at the University of South Carolina. The Center for Rural Education serves to promote rural education in South Carolina by providing technical assistance to the rural schools and school districts in the State. The basic mission of the Center for Rural Education is to

improve educational practices and impact State policy by conducting research on central concerns of rural education in the State of South Carolina.The Center for Rural Education publishes a newsletter on rural education twice a year. The newsletter, Crossroads: A Rural Education Newsletter, is disseminated to all of the ninety-one school districts in the State of South Carolina.

The Center for Rural Education in the College of Education at the University of South Carolina also sponsors an annual invitational conference for select school districts in South Carolina. The conference is jointly sponsored by the South Carolina Economic Development Board; the Office of the Governor, State of South Carolina; and by the Southeastern Education Improvement Laboratory (SEIL).

The University of South Carolina - The University of the Philippines Project

The University of South Carolina and the University of the Philippines are participating in a three-year cross cultural research study of rural school districts. The study is examining teacher education programs and their impact on public school education in rural school districts. In addition, the study is examining the factors which contribute to equity and quality within the school setting. Rural schools in both South Carolina and the Philippines are involved in the three-year study designed to look at the impact of teacher education programs on rural education.

The University of South Carolina - South Carolina Educational Policy Center

The South Carolina Educational Policy Center which is located in the College of Education at the University of South Carolina conducts policy research on central concerns of schooling at the State, National, and local levels. It has as its basic mission to improve educational practices and impact South Carolina policy by conducting research which provides new knowledge considered useful to political and educational leaders in South Carolina. Among recent studies, the Policy Center conducted a study on early retirement options and burnout among teachers in South Carolina. The study included approximately 5,000 South Carolina teachers in a survey about burnout, working conditions, and interest in early retirement. The study also polled retired teachers in South Carolina. Both rural and urban school districts were represented in the study, since the study involved all of the ninety-one South Carolina school districts.

The South Carolina Educational Policy Center is also conducting a study of the South Carolina Teacher Cadet Program. The South Carolina Teacher Cadet Program is a program designed to attract bright high school students to the teaching profession. The results of this should prove useful to school districts as they address problems related to teacher recruitment.

The Electronic Classroom

The College of Education is currently installing an electronic classroom. The electronic classroom will enable the College of Education to take education courses to various locations across the

State, without having to leave the Columbia Campus. The electronic classroom is being equipped with the latest "new information technology" and will provide for two-way, interactive elecetronic conferencing.

Satellite Communications Project- STAR Schools

Faculty in the College of Education at the University of South Carolina are working collaboratively with educational leaders across the State and in several other states to plan, design, develop, and implement new programs of study for both teachers and students. The Consortium is made up of 23 states, and includes: The Rural Education Center in the College of Education at the University of South Carolina; The South Carolina Department of Education; and fifty different high schools (mostly rural) located throughout the Consortium. During this year alone, 1,200 high school students throughout the Consortium will have an opportunity to earn one Carnegie unit in Russian; while another 1,050 will have the opportunity to earn one Carnegie unit of credit in Japanese. Also, the Universty of South Carolina is offering two advanced Placement (AP) courses for teachers; AP Calculus and AP Economics. With the completion of the electronic classroom in the College of Education, satellite communications technology will facilitate the efficient delivery of effective programs to more diverse and larger populations, and in multiple and varied settings.

Instructional Technology

The faculty of the College of Education at the University of South Carolina recognize that information technology holds significant promise and services to the students and professional staffs if the ninty-one school districts in South Carolina. The Instructional Technology Center in the University of South Carolina's College of Education provides on-site training and experiences for teachers of K-12 students. A recent cooperative agreement with IBM will significantly strengthen the capability of the Center.

The College of Education works collaboratively with officials of the South Carolina Department of Education in order to provide quality services for the public schools. The College of Education supports the Department of Education's endeavors to improve the use of instructional television and radio resources, and computer software; and the Department's efforts to expand television reception for the school districts in the State of South Carolina.

In the 1988-89 Annual Report: Executive Summary, officials of The Office of Instructional Technology at the South Carolina Department of Education report the following:

As of 1989, the public schools of South Carolina have a total of 36,524 computers. Of the major computer holdings, 57% are **Apple**. Also, a total of 1,085 schools (98%) in the ninety-one school districts have computers. During the 1988-89 school year, 95% of the schools used ITV (via open circuit,

Instructional Television Fixed Services (ITFS), or taped programs). Eighty-three percent of the students used ITV; 1,037 schools had some videotape recording equipment for instruction; and some 19,753 ITV using teachers had use of 18,251 televisions sets for instruction. During the 1988-89 school year, 214 instructional television series were broadcast several times during the year. Also, 52 radio series containing 961 programs were broadcast. A total of 459 television and 88 radio programs, comprising a total of 546 staff development programs were broadcast. Five hundred and two educators in public schools of South Carolina received credit in ITV certificate renewal courses. In addition, a total of 17 telecasts and teleconferences were provided in topics of educational interest. The data and information contained in the 1988-89 Annual Report of The Office of Instructional Technology reflect the total of all ninety-one school districts.

Bibliography

Aluri, R; Winecoff,L; and Lyday, J. State Laws May Not Be Enough: The AP Experience in Small Rural High Schools In South Carolina, Journal of Rural and Small Schools. Winter, 1989.

Lyday, J; Winecoff, L; and Kemper R. Rural High School Students Interest in Teaching, Rural Education Journal. Winter, 1989-90.

The State Newspaper, A Special Report: Our Schools-Part 2: January 22, 1984.

The State Newspaper, A Special Report: Our Schools-Part 3: January 29, 1984.

South Carolina Department of Education. Office of Instructional Technology, 1988 -89 Annual Report: Executive Summary, 1989.

South Carolina Department of Education, Rankings of the Counties and School Districts of South Carolina: 1987 - 88, 1989 Edition.

South Carolina School Boards Association. Chart of Fiscal Authority of South Carolina School Districts: February, 1988.

Staggers, S. and Winecoff , L. Changing Profiles of Black Institutions of Higher Education, Journal of the Southeastern Association of Educational Opportunity Program Personnel. Spring, 1988.

APPENDICES

TABLES 1 - 13

TABLE I

SOUTH CAROLINA SCHOOL DISTRICT CLASSIFIED AS RURAL, 1980.

CALHOUN
CLARENDON 1
CLARENDON 3
DILLON 1
DILLON 3
DORCHESTER 4
FLORENCE 2
FLORENCE 4
FLORENCE 5
GREENWOOD 51
GREENWOOD 52
HAMPTON 2
JASPER
LEXINGTON 4
MCCORMICK
MARION 3
MARION 4
ORANGEBURG 1
ORANGEBURG 2
ORANGEBURG 3
ORANGEBURG 6
ORANGEBURG 7
ORANGEBURG 8
SPARTANBURG 1

South Carolina Department of Education: Rankings of the Counties and School Districts of South Carolina , 1987 - 88, 1989

Table 2
Area in Square Miles and Population, 1980 by School District

DISTRICT	SQUARE MILES	POPULATION
CALHOUN	392	12,206
CLARENDON 1	200	7,444
CLARENDON 3	125	5,196
DILLON 1	100	5,731
DILLON 3	146	6,969
DORCHESTER 4	329	14,849
FLORENCE 2	142	5,776
FLORENCE 4	75	6,725
FLORENCE 5	88	5,042
GREENWOOD 51	79	10,189
GREENWOOD 52	92	6,855
HAMPTON 2	242	6,628
JASPER	652	14,504
LEXINGTON 4	109	6,365
MCCORMICK	360	7,797
MARION 3	109	3,400
MARIONS 4	117	2,558
ORANGEBURG 1	167	6,068
ORANGEBURG 2	152	7,064
ORANGEBURG 3	217	13,803
ORANGEBURG 6	125	4,824
ORANGEBURG 7	63	2,911
ORANGEBURG 8	109	3,256
SPARTANBURG 1	117	19,494
S.C. TOTALS	30,138	3,121,820
DISTRICT MEDIAN	217	

Source: South Carolina Department of Education: Rankings of the Counties and School Districts of South Carolina , 1987 - 88, 1989

TABLE 3

Percent of

Column I Population Eighteen Years or Older Not Completing High School, 1980;
Column II Headed by single parent, 1980;
Column III Median household income, 1979; and
Column IV Families falling below poverty level in 1979

DISTRICT	I	II	III	IV
CALHOUN	49.5	23.5	12,527	17.3
CLARENDON 1	57.9	38.2	9,458	30.6
CLARENDON 3	55.6	20.7	11,462	23.9
DILLON 1	55.0	24.8	10,671	24.4
DILLON 3	55.2	26.1	10,033	28.5
DORCHESTER 4	54.9	21.8	11,545	22.3
FLORENCE 2	54.1	20.0	11,595	21.6
FLORENCE 4	55.8	25.4	10,960	27.5
FLORENCE 5	54.5	20.1	12,341	19.9
GREENWOOD 51	51.6	13.8	15,443	6.6
GREENWOOD 52	47.3	19.2	14,693	11.0
HAMPTON 2	62.0	31.7	9,297	32.3
JASPER	50.7	28.3	10,804	25.7
LEXINGTON 4	55.6	15.0	13,896	14.8
MCCORMICK	53.0	25.8	11,756	20.4
MARION 3	51.6	30.1	12,813	21.4
MARION 4	51.8	22.8	11,039	25.9
ORANGEBURG 1	56.0	21.4	11,569	25.6
ORANGEBURG 2	52.0	23.3	11,080	23.0
ORANGEBURG 3	55.1	29.1	9,242	32.8
ORANGEBURG 6	52.2	23.2	12,492	18.3
ORANGEBURG 7	55.5	31.8	7,821	31.7
ORANGEBURG 8	56.8	25.8	10,785	21.8
SPARTANBURG 1	52.4	15.3	14,989	10.0
S.C. TOTALS	42.6	22.0		13.1
S.C. MEDIAN	-	-	14,711	
DISTRICT MEDIAN	51.5	21.8	13,268	14.8

Source: South Carolina Department of Education: Rankings , 1987 - 88, 1989

TABLE 4

COLUMN I AVERAGE DAILY MEMBERSHIP (K-12); 1987-88
COLUMN II 35 DAY ENROLLMENT (K-12); 1987-88
COLUMN III PERCENT CHANGE IN ENROLLMENT (1-12); 1978-88
COLUMN IV PERCENT PUPILS ELIGIBLE FOR FREE/REDUCED LUNCH, 1987.

DISTRICT	I	II	III	IV
CALHOUN	1,956	2,022	-17.4	77.5
CLARENDON 1	1,275	1,302	-38.3	96.5
CLARENDON 3	1,320	1,339	+ 3.7	61.1
DILLON 1	1,070	1,084	-13.5	71.5
DILLON 3	1.678	1,712	-12.0	68.6
DORCHESTER 4	2,562	2.606	-20.4	68.1
FLORENCE 2	1,381	1,396	- 3.6	58.5
FLORENCE 4	1,462	1,479	- 9.6	78.9
FLORENCE 5	1,353	1,392	+ 4.3	47.7
GREENWOOD 51	1,178	1,197	- 6.8	31.4
GREENWOOD 52	1,422	1,481	- 9.1	26.5
HAMPTON 2	1,550	1.592	- 6.0	92.4
JASPER	2,855	2,987	-12.8	78.9
LEXINGTON 4	1,945	2,038	+21.1	32.6
MCCORMICK	1,571	1,604	-24.4	70.5
MARION 3	694	702	-16.8	89.8
MARION 4	566	574	+ 6.8	80.5
ORANGEBURG 1	1,126	1,141	-16.8	78.0
ORANGEBURG 2	848	864	-26.8	83.2
ORANGEBURG 3	3,293	3,338	-21.4	82.7
ORANGEBURG 6	926	942	-28.5	67.8
ORANGEBURG 7	895	914	-17.5	90.1
ORANGEBURG 8	633	651	+ 8.2	61.8
SPARTANBURG 1	3,755	3,885	-11,5	24.7
S.C.TOTALS	612,790	630,376	-5.1	41.1
DISTRICT MEDIAN	3,735	3,799	-7 7	47.7

Source: South Carolina Department of Education: Rankings , 1987 - 88, 1989

TABLE 5

PERCENT OF 1987 GRADUATES

COLUMN I- ENTERING JUNIOR/SENIOR COLLEGES;
COLUMN II - OTHER POST-SECONDARY SCHOOLS; AND
COLUMN III - EMPLOYMENT

DISTRICT	I	II	III
CALHOUN	36.7	6.1	57.1
CLARENDON 1	42.3	10.8	46.8
CLARENDON 3	45.3	1.2	53.5
DILLON 1	32.8	8.6	58.6
DILLON 3	36.0	6.0	58.0
DORCHESTER 4	36.6	2.8	60.6
FLORENCE 2	33.8	17.5	48.8
FLORENCE 4	24.2	.0	75.8
FLORENCE 5	54.3	1.2	44.4
GREENWOOD 51	52.8	.0	47.2
GREENWOOD 52	48.9	8.5	42.6
HAMPTON 2	49.3	.0	50.7
JASPER	44.4	.0	55.6
LEXINGTON 4	35.6	2.3	62.1
MCCORMICK	29.4	12.7	57.8
MARION 3	20.9	11.6	67.4
MARION 4	41.4	.0	58.6
ORANGEBURG 1	36.6	14.6	48.8
ORANGEBURG 2	48.8	2.4	48.8
ORANGEBURG 3	42.1	2.8	55.2
ORANGEBURG 6	21.8	9.1	69.1
ORANGEBURG 7	41.9	2.3	55.8
ORANGEBURG 8	80.0	4.0	16.0
SPARTANBURG 1	50.4	.9	48.7
S.C.TOTALS	47.4	6.0	46.6
DISTRICT MEDIAN	42.9	5.2	50.5

Source: South Carolina Department of Education: Rankings , 1987 - 88, 1989

TABLE 6

EDUCATION LEVEL OF PROFESSIONAL STAFF, 1988 - 89

DISTRICT	PROFESSIONAL STAFF	MASTER'S DEGREE	SIX YEAR & DOCTORATE
CALHOUN	161	81 (50.3%)	14 (8.7%)
CLARENDON 1	84	23 (27.4%)	6 (7.1%)
CLARENDON 3	82	22 (26.8%)	8 (9.8%)
DILLON 1	68	21 (30.9%)	5 (7.4%)
DILLON 3	113	42 (37.2%)	9 (8.0%)
DORCHESTER 4	181	68 (37.6%)	18 (9.9%)
FLORENCE 2	88	37 (42.0%)	7 (8.0%)
FLORENCE 4	100	27 (27.0%)	4(4.0%)
FLORENCE 5	90	40 (44.4%)	10 (11.1%)
GREENWOOD 51	82	30 (36.6%)	6(7.3%)
GREENWOOD 52	104	47 (45.2%)	10 (9.6%)
HAMPTON 2	115	31 (27.0%)	6 (5.2%)
JASPER	188	48 (25.5%)	10 (5.3%)
LEXINGTON 4	121	45 (37.2%)	7 (5.8%)
MCCORMICK	113	32 (28.3%)	10 (8.8%)
MARION 3	55	12 (21.8%)	3 (5.5%)
MARION 4	45	10 (22.2%)	4 (8.9%)
ORANGEBURG 1	83	32 (38.6%)	2 (2.4%)
ORANGEBURG 2	66	23 (34.8%)	4 (6.1%)
ORANGEBURG 3	234	96 (41.0%)	25(10.7%)
ORANGEBURG 6	65	19 (29.2%)	2 (3.1%)
ORANGEBURG 7	65	29 (44.6%)	3 (4.6%)
ORANGEBURG 8	46	18 (39.1%)	4 (8.7%)
SPARTANBURG 1	267	113 (42.3%)	49 (18.4%)
S.C.STATE TOTALS	42,217	18,142 (43%)	3,604 (8.5%)
DISTRICT MEDIAN		39.3%	8.7%

Source: South Carolina Department of Education: Rankings , 1987 - 88, 1989

TABLE 7
CURRENT SALARY SCHEDULE FOR TEACHERS,
(BACHELOR'S DEGREE AND ZERO EXPERIENCE) 1987-88
AND
PERCENT TEACHER TURNOVER 1986-87 TO 1987-88

DISTRICT	SALARY SCHEDULE	TEACHER TURNOVER
CALHOUN	16,959	13.0
CLARENDON 1	17,159	1.6
CLARENDON 3	16,759	6.3
DILLON 1	16,759	7.4
DILLON 3	16,759	9.4
DORCHESTER 4	17,593	11.3
FLORENCE 2	17,134	11.6
FLORENCE 4	16,759	15.5
FLORENCE 5	17,009	9.3
GREENWOOD 51	16,760	19.4
GREENWOOD 52	17,639	6.2
HAMPTON 2	17,932	30.1
JASPER	17,759	12.6
LEXINGTON 4	17,355	6.5
MCCORMICK	16,941	9.7
MARION 3	16,859	19.5
MARION 4	16,759	11.4
ORANGEBURG 1	17,759	4.3
ORANGEBURG 2	16,759	15.1
ORANGEBURG 3	18,259	8.6
ORANGEBURG 6	16,959	21.3
ORANGEBURG 7	16,759	26.5
ORANGEBURG 8	16,726	18.2
SPARTANBURG 1	18,435	7.6
S.C.STATE TOTALS	16,759	9.0
DISTRICT MEDIAN	17,391	10.6

Source: South Carolina Department of Education: Rankings , 1987 - 88, 1989

TABLE 8

TOTAL TAX LEVY IN MILLS, 1987 -88

DISTRICT	CURRENT OPERATIONS	DEBT SERVICE	TOTAL LEVY	MILL VALUE
CALHOUN	87	17	104	$38,112
CLARENDON 1	85	3	88	8,391
CLARENDON 3	99	8	107	4,000
DILLON 1	87.5	5	92.5	4,480
DILLON 3	61	5	66	31,000
DORCHESTER 4	105	10	115	27,500
FLORENCE 2	66.8	9.5	76.3	7,100
FLORENCE 4	104.2	12	116.2	5,000
FLORENCE 5	80.7	3.5	115.7	8,700
GREENWOOD 51	120.10	0.0	120.1	6,000
GREENWOOD 52	77.4	8.3	85.7	15,986
HAMPTON 2	199	28	227	6.895
JASPER	112	54	116	19.335
LEXINGTON 4	84	65	149	13,070
MCCORMICK	74	7	81	2,485
MARION 3	102	13	115	2,408
MARION 4	135	20	115	8,000
ORANGEBURG 1	118	0.0	118	4,575
ORANGEBURG 2	134	0.0	134	3,904
ORANGEBURG 3	138	7	145	17,133
ORANGEBURG 6	102	19	121	4,225
ORANGEBURG 7	115	38	153	6,200
ORANGEBURG 8	141	0.0	141	2,516
SPARTANBURG 1	106.6	10.8	117.4	29,969
S.C. TOTALS				
DISTRICT MEAN	98.21	20.1	118.31	
DISTRICT MEDIAN			115.70	

Source: South Carolina Department of Education: Rankings , 1987 - 88, 1989

TABLE 9
REVENUE PER PUPIL IN AVERAGE DAILY MEMBERSHIP FROM
LOCAL, STATE, AND FEDERAL SOURCES, 1987 - 88

DISTRICT	LOCAL	STATE	FEDERAL
CALHOUN	$ 1,985.23	$1,637.49	$612.16
CLARENDON 1	649.93	2,048.22	726.01
CLARENDON 3	406.54	2,142.86	428.40
DILLON 1	565.79	2,128.57	460.14
DILLON 3	507.44	2,085.85	515.86
DORCHESTER 4	1,319.31	1,760.01	413.11
FLORENCE 2	515.14	2,083.74	402.23
FLORENCE 4	530.44	2,203.52	636.63
FLORENCE 5	708.58	1,905.96	300.29
GREENWOOD 51	969.25	2,039.26	205.67
GREENWOOD 52	1,489.11	1,813.21	212.26
HAMPTON 2	1,005.93	2,239.60	566.12
JASPER	878.78	2,031.81	544.36
LEXINGTON 4	752.94	1,897.55	222.35
MCCORMICK	502.00	2,100.59	563.32
MARION 3	783.45	2,259.81	649.01
MARION 4	809.72	2,368.06	504.96
ORANGEBURG 1	695.16	2,169.87	538.03
ORANGEBURG 2	867.93	2,127.83	837.03
ORANGEBURG 3	890.17	2,100.76	479.23
ORANGEBURG 6	644.18	2,126.76	437.41
ORANGEBURG 7	1,063.34	2,216.38	606.50
ORANGEBURG 8	956.48	2,213.71	547.62
SPARTANBURG 1	1,306.10	1,901.85	220.00
S.C.TOTALS	1,154.71	1,840.59	311.05
DISTRICT MEDIAN	893.49	1.981.49	325.50

Source: South Carolina Department of Education: Rankings , 1987 - 88. 1989

TABLE 10
REVENUE RECEIVED PER PUPIL IN AVERAGE DAILY MEMBERSHIOP
FOR CAPITAL OUTLAY AND DEBT SERVICE, 1987 - 88

DISTRICT	REVENUE
CALHOUN	364.84
CLARENDON 1	18.47
CLARENDON 3	50.69
DILLON 1	292.03
DILLON 3	68.51
DORCHESTER 4	274.15
FLORENCE 2	58.82
FLORENCE 4	267.32
FLORENCE 5	382.24
GREENWOOD 51	64.36
GREENWOOD 52	157.68
HAMPTON 2	149.08
JASPER	730.24
LEXINGTON 4	549.81
MCCORMICK	98.19
MARION 3	116.33
MARION 4	156.97
ORANGEBURG 1	119.66
ORANGEBURG 2	88.55
ORANGEBURG 3	459.09
ORANGEBURG 6	156.42
ORANGEBURG 7	792.65
ORANGEBURG 8	52.99
SPARTANBURG 1	134.92
S.C.TOTALS	$311.63
DISTRICT MEDIAN	194.04

Source: South Carolina Department of Education; Rankings , 1987 - 88, 1989

Table 11

Currrent Expenditures per Pupil in Average Daily Membership, 1987-88

DISTRICT	OPERATING	CAPITAL OUTLAY	DEBT SERVICES
CALHOUN	$ 4,102.57	34.51	458.36
CLARENDON 1	3,408.65	21.41	6.67
CLARENDON 3	2.965.61	11.66	37.90
DILLON 1	2,957.26	1,494.37	52.49
DILLON 3	3,011.87	81.7	61.11
DORCHESTER 4	3,461.03	394.42	171.19
FLORENCE 2	2,915.4	1.12	45.17
FLORENCE 4	3,180.75	456.80	79.87
FLORENCE 5	2,982.66	119.25	225.95
GREENWOOD 51	3,178.62	76.59	0.00
GREENWOOD 52	3.423.45	63.9	113.80
HAMPTON 2	3,674.85	39.87	118.48
JASPER	3,525.00	925.72	961.81
LEXINGTON 4	2,838,98	3.62	513.71
MCCORMICK	3,157.76	137.66	53.12
MARION 3	3,561.00	78.26	40.13
MARION 4	3,738.47	549.65	54.95
ORANGEBURG 1	3,579.81	121.21	0.00
ORANGEBURG 2	3,680.88	296.14	298.71
ORANGEBURG 3	3,145.64	44.69	37.65
ORANGEBURG 6	3,170.54	57.05	76.99
ORANGEBURG 7	3.399.22	2,303.15	141.95
ORANGEBURG 8	3.369.37	13.88	24.22
SPARTANBURG 1	3.403.64	127.92	66.52
S.C. TOTALS	$3,248.29	$ 268.07	$ 258.01
DISTRICT MEDIAN	3,180.75	114.90	181.73

Source: South Carolina Department of Education: Rankings , 1987 - 88, 1989

TABLE 12

LOCAL TAX EFFORT AND STATE RANKING FOR 1987-88

DISTRICT	TAX EFFORT	RANK
CALHOUN	1.025	56
CLARENDON 1	.801	83
CLARENDON 3	1.092	46
DILLON 1	1.196	35
DILLON 3	1.051	53
DORCHESTER 4	1.281	28
FLORENCE 2	.936	66
FLORENCE 4	1.127	43
FLORENCE 5	.938	65
GREENWOOD 51	1.680	7
GREENWOOD 52	1.368	20
HAMPTON 2	2.235	1
JASPER	1.214	33
LEXINGTON 4	.946	63
MCCORMICK	.788	85
MARION 3	1.943	4
MARION 4	2.105	2
ORANGEBURG 1	1.349	23
ORANGEBURG 2	1.530	10
ORANGEBURG 3	1.493	12
ORANGEBURG 6	1.171	38
ORANGEBURG 7	1.286	27
ORANGEBURG 8	1.542	9
SPARTANBURG 1	1.506	11

Tax Effort is defined as the ratio calculated by dividing tax revenue by equalized revenue for a school district.

Note: Eight(8) of the 100% rural school districts (Hampton 2, Marion 2, Marion 3, Greenwood 51, Orangeburg 8, Orangeburg 2, Spartanburg 1, and Orangeburg 3) rank among the top twelve school districts in the State of South Carolina in local tax effort for 1987-88.

Two (2) of the 100% rural school districts (Clarendon 1 and McCormick) rank among the bottom twelve school districts in the State of South Carolina in local tax effort for 1987-88.

South Carolina currently has 91 school districts.

Source: South Carolina Department of Education: Rankings , 1987 - 88, 1989

TABLE 13

FISCAL AUTHORITY OF RURAL SOUTH CAROLINA SCHOOL DISTRICTS

KEY TO TABLE BELOW

* School Board may raise amount of millage by five (5) mills beyond the EFA minimum by legislative proviso. Authority to increase levy lies with referendum.

** School Board may raise amount of millage by twelve mills beyond the EFA minimum by legislative proviso. Authority to increase levy lies with referendum.

*** County Board of Education may raise the amount of millage up tothe annual EFA Inflation Factor. County Board approves budget.

**** Authority to increase the levy lies with County Council.

***** Authority to increase the levy lies with the Town Manager.

****** Authority to increase the levy lies with the Legislative Delegation.

No Authority	Statutory Authority (Limited) (School Board)	Statutory Authority (Limited) (County Board)	Total Independence (School Board)	Total Independence (County Board)
****	*	***		
Calhoun	Orangeburg 1	Marion 3	Lexington 4	Spartanburg 1
Clarendon 1	Orangeburg 2	Marion 4		
Clarendon 3	Orangeburg 3			
Dorchester 4	Orangeburg 6			
Greenwood 51	Orangeburg 7			
Greenwood 52	**			
Hampton 2	Orangeburg 8			
Jasper				
McCormick				
*****				
Florence 2				
Florence 4				
Florence 5				
******				
Dillon 1				
Dillon 3				

NOTE: Five districts have appointed boards (Clarendon1, Dillon 1, Dillon Dillon 3, Marion 3, and Marion 4). Also note: The Dillon County Board approves budgets for all districts and subjits to legislative delegation for approval. The Greenwood County Board reviews budgets for all districts and submite to County Council for approval. The Marion County Eoard has limited fiscal authority and approves budgets for all district. The Spartanbrug County Board is fiscally independent and approves budgets for all districts.

Chart, S.C. School Boards Association, February, 1988.